

REMARKS

Claims 21-21 and 23-24 have been cancelled. Claims 1-19 have been amended. Claims 1-19 remain for further consideration. No new matter has been added.

The objections and rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

1. Claim 20 has been cancelled.
2. Claims 13-19 and 24 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for alleging failing to enable the claimed invention.

It respectfully submitted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not presented since the Official Action fails to resolve what the level of skill is for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. In any event, the applicant would like to point out the subject matter recited starting on page 5, line 1 of the application and running through page 6, line 6, *inter alia*, as enabling the claimed subject matter.

3. Claims 1-21, 23 and 24 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for alleging failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The claims have been amended to resolve this issue.

4. Claims 1, 5, and 6 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter recited in U.S. Patent 3,755,618 to Poppy (hereinafter “Poppy”) and U.S. Patent 5,101,509 to Lai (hereinafter “Lai”).

Claim 1 recites a television receiver that includes:

“a tuner that receives a transmitted signal from an antenna and provides a received signal;

a selective filter stage that receives the received signal containing chrominance and luminance components and provides a filtered signal;

an intermediate-frequency stage that receives the filtered signal and processes the filtered signal to provide a processed signal; and” (emphasis added, cl. 1).

The Official Action contends that element 21 illustrated in FIG. 1 of Poppy reads on the selective filter stage recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Specifically, the Official Action alleges “*a selective filter stage 21 connected [to] the tuner by intermediate stages 12 and 13 and electrically associated therewith;*”. (Official Action, pg. 4). However, Poppy discloses that element 21 is a chrominance processing channel (see col. 3, lines 25-26; col. 4, lines 21-36). As shown in FIG. 1 of Poppy, the chrominance processing channel 21 receives **only** the chrominance signal from the Y&C detector 13. In contrast, claim 1 recites “*a selective filter stage that receives the received signal containing chrominance and luminance components and provides a filtered signal;*”. (emphasis added, cl. 1). Accordingly, even assuming for the moment without admitting that Poppy and Lai are even properly combinable, the resultant combination is still incapable of rendering the claimed invention obvious since it fails to suggest at least the feature of “*a selective filter stage that receives the received signal containing chrominance and luminance components and provides a filtered signal;*”. (emphasis added, cl. 1).

5. Claims 1-4 and 24 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter recited in U.S. Patent 4,107,730 to Jones (hereinafter “Jones”) and Lai.

Claim 1 recites a television receiver that includes:

“a tuner that receives a transmitted signal from an antenna and provides a received signal;
a selective filter stage that receives the received signal containing chrominance and luminance components and provides a filtered signal;
an intermediate-frequency stage that receives the filtered signal and processes the filtered signal to provide a processed signal; and” (emphasis added, cl. 1).

The IF stage 12 in Jones does not receive a filtered signal from a selective filter stage as recited in claim 1. The Official Action construes elements 20-22 shown in FIG. 1 of Jones as the selective filter (see Official Action, pg. 5). However, elements 20-22 do not provide a filtered signal to the IF amplifier 12 shown in FIG. 1 of Jones. Specifically, a fair and proper reading of Jones fails to reveal “*an intermediate-frequency stage that receives said filtered signal*” since the IF stage 12 in Jones only receives a signal from the tuner 11.

In addition, the Official Action contends that filter stage 20 illustrated in FIG. 1 of Jones reads on the selective filter stage recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Specifically, the Official Action alleges “*his television receiver (noting Fig. 1) includes a tuner connected to a filter stage 20-22 by way of IF amp that receives a video signal from antenna 10;*” (Official Action, pg. 5). However, as shown in FIG. 1 of Jones the BW means 20 only receives the signal from the AGC 22. Therefore, the “filter stage” 20-22 of Poppy which only receives the signal from the AGC 22 is clearly incapable of reading on the “*selective filter stage that receives the received signal containing chrominance and luminance components and provides a filtered signal;*” (emphasis added, cl. 1). That is, the selective filter stage of claim 1 receives the received signal containing chrominance and luminance components, while the so-called “filter

stage” 20-22 receives only an AGC output signal, which does not include chrominance and luminance components.

Accordingly, even assuming for the moment without admitting that Jones and Lai are even properly combinable, the resultant combination is still incapable of rendering the claimed invention obvious since it fails to suggest at least the feature of “*a selective filter stage that receives the received signal containing chrominance and luminance components and provides a filtered signal;*”. (emphasis added, cl. 1).

6. Claims 1, 2, 7-13 and 18-23 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter recited in U.S. Patent 6,473,134 to Nohara et al (hereinafter “Nohara”) and Lai.

Claim 1 recites a television receiver that includes:

“a tuner that receives a transmitted signal from an antenna and provides a received signal;

a selective filter stage that receives the received signal containing chrominance and luminance components and provides a filtered signal;

an intermediate-frequency stage that receives the filtered signal and processes the filtered signal to provide a processed signal;

and at least one field-strength-detection stage that receives the processed signal, and generates a field strength signal proportional to the field strength of the processed signal, and which generates a control signal derived from the field strength signal,

where the selective filter stage implements a transfer function that is modifiable by the control signal.” (emphasis added, cl. 1).

The Official Action contends “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to arrange the filtering stage prior to the IF processing stage in the receiver of Jones, for the specifically disclosed benefit of maximizing the sensitivity of the receiver, taught by Lai, thereby meeting claims 1, 11, 20, 22 and 23” (emphasis added, Official Action, pg. 6). It is not clear

from the Official Action if the rejection is: (i) Jones in view of Lai, or (ii) Nohara in view of Lai. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

However, the applicant shall assume for the moment that the rejection is based upon the combination of Nohara and Lai. Assuming for the moment without admitting that Nohara and Lai are even combinable, the resultant combination still fails to render claim 1 obvious. Specifically, claim 1 includes the feature of “*at least one field-strength-detection stage that receives the processed signal, and generates a field strength signal proportional to the field strength of the processed signal, and which generates a control signal derived from the field strength signal,*” (emphasis added, cl. 1). Significantly, in the receiver of claim 1, the control signal is derived from the field strength signal, which is proportional to the field strength of the processed signal. In contrast, as shown in FIG. 1 of Nohara the signal from the receiving means 2 is input to the electric field information detecting means 7. The signal from the receiving means 2 of Nohara is not a “*processed signal*” as set forth in claim 1. Accordingly, the combination of Nohara and Lai is still incapable of rendering the claimed invention obvious since the combination fails to suggest at least the feature of “*at least one field-strength-detection stage that receives the processed signal, and generates a field strength signal proportional to the field strength of the processed signal, and which generates a control signal derived from the field strength signal,*” (emphasis added, cl. 1).

Claim 11 recites a television receiver comprising:

“a tuner that receives a transmitted signal from an antenna and provides a received signal indicative thereof;

a first selective filter stage that receives and filters the received signal to provide a filtered signal, wherein the selective filter stage implements a transfer function that is modifiable by one or more control signals derived from a field strength signal; and

an intermediate-frequency stage that receives and processes a signal indicative of the filtered signal to provide a processed signal and generates a first control signal of the one or more control signals.” (emphasis added, cl. 11).

Significantly, the television receiver of claim 11 includes “*an intermediate-frequency stage that receives and processes a signal indicative of the filtered signal to provide processed signal and generates a first control signal of the one or more control signals.*” (emphasis add, cl. 11). As set forth above, Nohara (e.g., see FIG. 1 of Nohara) merely discloses that the receiving means 2 provides a signal to the electric field information detecting means 7, which in turn provides a signal to the video signal stabilizing means 8. Thus, the signal which the electric field information detecting means 8 operates upon is a signal from the receiving means 2, and not a signal indicative of a filtered signal from a selective filter as recited in claim 11. Accordingly, the combination of Nohara and Lai is still incapable of rendering the claimed invention obvious since the combination fails to suggest at least the feature of “*an intermediate-frequency stage that receives and processes a signal indicative of the filtered signal to provide processed signal and generates a first control signal of the one or more control signals.*” (emphasis add, cl. 11).

7. Claims 14, 15 and 17 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in Nohara, Jones and Lai.

It is respectfully submitted that this rejection is now moot since claim 11 is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

8. Claim 16 currently stands rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in Nohara, Lai and Poppy.

It is respectfully submitted that this rejection is now moot since claim 11 is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-19 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. O'Shea
Reg. No. 35,305
O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C.
1500 Main Street, Suite 912
Springfield, MA 01115
(413) 731-3100, Ext. 102